

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 7-10 have been amended to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. In addition, dependent claims 30 through 32 have been canceled. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Action, claims 7-10 and 31-32 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, it was alleged that several phrases in claims 7 and 10 were indefinite; claim 9 contained a phrase apparently lacking in antecedent basis; and claim 10 included a phrase which was indefinite. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, claims 7, 9 and 10 have been amended herein to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. It is submitted that the claims are now in full conformity with the provisions of the cited statute. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over, the patent to Chen et al. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that the cited Chen et al patent does not teach or suggest the semiconductor device as defined by independent claims 1, 7 and 10 and the claims dependent thereon. Among other things, claims 1, 7 and 10, as amended require, at least

in part, that a heat conductor is made of bundle of carbon nanotubes.

In distinct contrast, the patent to Chen et al discloses demountable heat spreader. In particular, the patent to Chen et al discloses a heat spreader 25 with a thermal interface material 33 made of carbon fiber as is set forth in column 5, line 24. In this regard, "carbon fiber" is distinguished over "bundle of carbon nanotubes" as required in claims 1, 7 and 10. Among other things, it is submitted that the concept of "nanotube" is different from that of "fiber."

In addition, with regard to the subject matter of claim 10, it was asserted in the Office Action that the first surface the substrate 25 according to the Chen et al patent was the surface that defines hole 27b. It is submitted that such is not correct. Claim 10 defines "a second heat conductor formed to cover the first upper surface of the SiC substrate entirely...." Thus claim 10 requires, not the inner surface of the hole , but the "upper surface" of the SiC substrate.

In conclusion, it is respectfully requested that the examiner reconsider the above rejections and allow the claims as amended which distinguish over the teachings of the cited Chen et al patent. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) and §103(a) and allowance of claims 1 through 10 as amended over the cited Chen et al patent are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2-6 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 040102
Suite 400, 1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930
DWH/rab



23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE